



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

307/15,306 54/07/01 J. L. L. L.

EXAMINER

O'NEILL, D.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

SPRINGER & COMPANY
115 019 COUNTRY ROAD
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401

5/11/01

DATE MAILED: 5/11/01

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

5/11/01

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1-22 are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

The drawings are objected to by the draftsman for reasons given on PTO form 948. The reference sign 10 is missing within the drawings.

The specification is objected to because of minor errors and the use of acronyms without first giving the antecedent compound term; this makes a clear understanding of the disclosure difficult. Applicant should review the specification for errors and provide the antecedent compound terms for the acronyms, especially in the summary of the invention section. There are discrepancies within the specification between the different "DS numbers" and the drawings and themselves. The Applicant should provide more information on these parts in the specification or provide where such information is publicly available and incorporate by reference into the specification.

Claims 3 and 6 through 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 3, "the currency validator" lacks antecedent basis. For claims 6 and 15, these claims appear to be combination claims, however this is not clearly recited. The claims will be interpreted as such and the Applicant should make the appropriate corrections. Also, in claim 15, the acronym of "IDA" is used twice: line 4 and line 8 for different elements. In claim 19, the acronyms lack antecedent compound terms.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this

section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7 and 15, as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Werth et al.

Werth et al discloses a portable collection unit used with vending machines to provide information to the owner of the machines with respect to its operation. Viewing fig. 2 the system

comprises game machine(9) in combination with a currency validator (coin counter 10) and wiring harness means including: an

addressable switch (counter interface 50); memory data means (RAM

33); software means (ROM 32); and read means for the data

(microprocessor 31). Thus the wiring harness includes the these

components supra in conjunction with the memory and data buses.

Hence the counter interface 50 is within the wiring harness and

detachably connects the wiring harness to the coin counter 10. The

system also includes a soft count conjunction with teletype means

40-41 and printer means 45-44 reads and displays the data with the memory means 33.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time

the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 2, 3 and 8, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Werth et al in view of Lacero et al '709.

What Werth discloses is stated supra. Werth lacks in disclosing whether the data is passed in serial or parallel. Lacero '709 teaches in fig. 14 and col. 12:23-66 the data being passed serially in an analogous device. Thus, one skilled in the art would have found as obvious the transfer of data in serial because such transfer eliminates the possible errors in passing data in parallel over a distance.

Claims 5, 9-13 and 16-22, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Werth et al.

JP What Werth discloses to the art is discussed supra. Whether something is made unitary or integral or separable is a design choice left to the inventor discretion because it is considered a carry over of another's invention. This is rebuttable with a showing that such fabrication is critical to the claimed invention and said claimed invention could not work absent this criticality. In this case, to make the claimed invention separable would permit

Serial No. 418,556
Art Unit 3304

-5-

the components to be replaced either for reasons of upgrade or repair. In regards to the method claims 19-22, the 19-22, the prior art discloses the elements of structure, hence one skilled in the art would find obvious providing said structure and using it in the universal manner Applicants have iterated.

Claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lacero et al '930, Harlick, Ishida, DeMar, Bruen et al, LeStrange et al, Reynolds and Sonoda disclose systems for auditing game machine operations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Michael O'Neill at telephone number (703) 308-2656.



JESSICA J. HARRISON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3300



M.O'Neill/pw
March 13, 1996
FAX: 703-305-3590